

## INTERNATIONAL HOMEOPATHIC CONGRESS.

HELD AT PARIS, JULY 18 TO 21, 1900.

ON Wednesday, July 18th, at 10 a.m., the sixth of the series of International Homeopathic Congresses was opened at Paris, under the presidency of Dr. Pierre Jousset. Drs. Chancerel, Brasol, and J. H. McClelland were elected Vice-Presidents. Dr. Hughes, permanent Secretary, took his place on the platform later on, a train-delay having prevented his being there at the opening of the proceedings. Dr. Léon Simon was Secretary General, Assistant Secretaries being, Drs. Cartier, M. Jousset, Love, Nimier, Serrand. M. Ecalle, Pharmacien, was Treasurer.

Here is a list of the members of the Congress, though we do not guarantee its completeness :—

## THURSDAY, JULY 19TH.

The morning of this day was spent by the members in visiting the two Homeopathic Hospitals of Paris, that of St. Jacques, rue des Volontaires, and L'hôpital Hahnemann, rue de Chézy, Neuilly.

At the afternoon session of Thursday, 19th, the first two papers considered were (1) Dr. GATCHELL on "The Action of Drugs in their natural state and in dilution, with an interpretation of the theory of Hahnemann on

dynamisation ” ; and (2) a paper by Dr. ELDRIDGE PRICE on “ Considerations on the Primary and Secondary Actions of Drugs.” These papers were replied to by Dr. HUGHES, who seemed to consider the theories advanced by the two writers as mutually destructive.

The next paper was that of Dr. KRAFT, of Cleveland, Ohio, whose illness unfortunately prevented his being able to present it in person. Dr. Kraft is nothing if he is not honest. He takes strong views at times and has a picturesque way of expressing them. Calmer reflection sometimes changes his views and then there is no more peace for him until he has donned the white sheet and cried *peccavi*. Something of this kind happened in regard to the *Cyclopedia of Drug Pathogenesy*. That work having been lauded as a kind of practitioner's handbook, Dr. Kraft's first view of it was sufficient to explode this notion, and he came to the conclusion that it was no good at all. Later reflection showed that though it was indeed no good for daily practice, it was not without virtues of another kind. Hence his paper.

Dr. CLARKE said he did not altogether share the early censures of Dr. Kraft on this work, nor his later praises. He knew from the beginning that the *Cyclopedia* was a very good work. He had had a very modest share in its compilation himself. It had its limits, which were altogether artificial, and excluded many important observations like those made on Caspar Hauser (see Dr. Dudgeon's article in HOMEOPATHIC WORLD, October, 1897). On this sensitive subject olfactions of homeopathic remedies in the 30th attenuation produced most violent, long-lasting, and characteristic effects. Yet the Cyclopedists, by their artificial rules, were precluded from making use of these. But its limits being granted, the *Cyclopedia* had a very great value of its own. It was a mine of wealth. But a mine is not of much use for paying daily debts. It needs miners, and metal-workers, and coiners. Dr. Hughes seemed to think that it is possible to practice homeopathy with the daily records of provings, and without having the symptoms arranged in the anatomical order of the Schema. This is impossible. Without the Schema there is no homeopathic materia medica. Dr. Clarke had protested from the beginning that the *Cyclopedia* would be of no value to the practitioner until each pathogenesis was arranged in schema form, and for this the *Index* compiled by Dr. Hughes was in no way a substitute.

Dr. Clarke went on to say that Dr. Cartier had done him the honour to accept on behalf of the *Société Homœopathique Française* a copy of vol. i. of his *Dictionary of Practical Materia Medica*, just published. In compiling this work he had

found the *Cyclopedia* of the greatest service, and he instanced the medicine *Duboisinum*. He had arranged in schema from the symptoms of this medicine from the *Cyclopedia* in the day-to-day records of the provers ; and he challenged a comparison between the two from the point of view of practical utility. He agreed with Dr. Kraft that the *Cyclopedia* was very interesting for study both by practitioner and student, in the same way as metallurgy was interesting to those who use metals. But for all that the *Cyclopedia* could not take the place of a materia medica with the symptoms arranged in anatomical order (that is to say, in the Schema as devised by Hahnemann) for the use of the practitioner. However interesting the *Cyclopedia* might be, the Schema was the essential of practice ; and after all, though metallurgy was very interesting, it was not necessary to be a metallurgist in order to spend a halfpenny.

Dr. ARNULPHY (Nice) said : I cannot allow some of Dr. Kraft's remarks to remain unchallenged. Judging from what he says, one might be led to conclude that it is a common thing to see students in the American Colleges of Homeopathy get dissatisfied with our materia medica and go over to the old school. Now this is far from being the case. I can talk from personal experience, having been for twelve years connected with the faculty of Hahnemann Medical College, of Chicago. Well, I can assure you, gentlemen, that instances of desertion among the students are exceedingly rare. I am sorry Dr. Kraft's experience should have been less satisfactory. But, at all events, it would be altogether wrong to saddle it upon the deficiencies of our materia medica. It would be more natural, methinks, to lay it at the door of the teacher. Sure enough our materia medica is sufficiently rich and deep and beautiful to deserve an effort in view of rendering it interesting. Do you believe, gentlemen, that when Hering, or Hempel, or Dunham lectured upon materia medica, that the students deserted the lecture hall, or even were caught napping? Do you believe any such thing happened when that admirable teacher, Farrington, discoursed on materia medica ? It would be easy to expatiate on such a subject, but all I desire to do, is to impart to the members of the Congress the assurance that the American Colleges are in no danger of collapse through desertion, and that our materia medica, in spite of shortcomings, finds a sufficient number of able and eloquent interpreters and teachers at this day, on the other side of the Atlantic, to insure for it abundant life, ever-growing interest, and a glorious future.

Dr. HUGHES (Brighton), expressed his pleasure at the changed attitude of Dr. Kraft in regard to the *Cyclopedia*. In

reference to the arrangement of the symptoms of the provings in the schema form (that is, separating the symptoms from their contexts and arranging them in anatomical order over " Mind," " Head," " Eyes," " Ears," &c.), Dr. Hughes contended that this was nothing short of a calamity. The *Cyclopedia* has been compiled to remedy this as far as possible, and he considered, now that the *Index* was complete, it was the proper and a sufficient materia medica for the practitioner's daily use. He hoped it would be made a text-book in all the colleges. With regard to Dr. Clarke's *Dictionary of Materia Medica* he feared that Dr. Clarke had followed Hering in not distinguishing between clinical symptoms and symptoms produced in the provings. Jahr had made this distinction. If his surmise turned out true he would be sorry, but he would feel compelled to condemn Dr. Clarke's work. He did not deny that clinical symptoms were often of use in effecting cures. But what he said was this : " You may cure with a clinical symptom ; but if you do you are not practising homeopathy."

Two papers on homeopathic pharmacy followed, one by M. ECALLE, Pharmacien, of Paris, on " A mode of preparing alcoholic pharmaceutics, with the dosage of the alkaloids contained in them " ; the other by Dr. CARMICHAEL, of Philadelphia, " On the Utility of an International Homeopathic Pharmacopeia." In the discussion which followed an attack was made on the tinctures of Dr. Cooper.

Dr. VAN DEN HEUVEL (of Kimberley, South Africa), vigorously defended Dr. Cooper's method as being practically Hahnemann's own. He illustrated his own method of making tinctures by the case of *Calendula*, the whole fresh plant of which was taken in its vigour when flowering and macerated with alcohol. Dried plants should never be used when living plants were available, as many of their subtle properties evaporated in the process of drying.

FRIDAY, JULY 20TH.